



PATENT

Case Docket No. KHAIT5.001APC

Date: May 16, 2005


IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s) : Sumit Bhaduri, et al.
Appl. No. : 10/502,219
Filed : July 21, 2004
For : OLEFIN POLYMERISATION
TITANIUM CATALYST
Group Art Unit : 1713
Class/Sub-Class : 526-140000
Examiner : Fred M. Teskin

I hereby certify that this correspondence and all marked attachments are being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Issue Fee, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on

May 16, 2005

(Date)


Karoline A. Delaney, Reg. No. 44,058


TRANSMITTAL LETTER

MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Enclosed for filing is the Issue Fee for the above-identified application:

- (X) Form PTOL-85.
- (X) Comments on Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
- (X) A check in the amount of \$1730 to cover the issue fee, publication fee, and advanced order of copies is enclosed.
- (X) The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Account No. 11-1410.
- (X) Return prepaid postcard.


Karoline A. Delaney
Registration No. 44,058
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

1711963/
051305



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Sumit Bhaduri, et al.)
)
Appl. No. : 10/502,219)
)
Filed : July 21, 2004)
)
For : OLEFIN POLYMERISATION)
 TITANIUM CATALYST)
)
Examiner : Fred M. Teskin)
)

COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance to the extent that there is any implication that the patentability of the claims rests only on the recitation of the particular features mentioned by Examiner in his Statement. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's Statement because it is the combination of features that makes the claims patentable. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 1-18, 20-26, and 28-35 allowable because the prior art does not teach or suggest the combination of features as recited by these claims.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: May 16, 2005

By: Karoline A. Delaney
Karoline A. Delaney
Registration No. 44,058
Attorney of Record
Customer Number 20,995